UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/753,514 | 01/04/2001 | Yasuyuki Fujikawa | 1506.1002 (JDH) | 3098 |

21171 7590 02/24/2005

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| SAIN, GAUTAM | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2176 | |

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 09/753,514 | FUJIKAWA, YASUYUKI | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Gautam Sain | 2176 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 September 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1) The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1-1) Regarding claims 1, 11, 12, 14 the phrase "possibly" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d). Please clarify terminology to concretely and definitely state the condition of a pattern of character string.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

**2-1) Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuwahara (US 6202072, filed Dec 1997), in view of Nakatsuyama et al (US 5752021, issued May 1998).**

**Regarding claim 1**, Kuwahara teaches "a reading module ... an identifier thereof" (ie., SGML conversion form generation module SGML document read-in module)(col 5, lines 1-18, lines 59-65).

Kuwahara teaches "a retrieving module which refers to the extraction ... target electronic document" (ie., prototype file of a plain text document)(col 5, lines 27, fig 2, item 105).

Kuwahara teaches "a structure document generating module ... the definition information" (ie., generate a SGML document from a plain text document prepared by a user as part of the two directional conversion between plain text document and a SGML document having a specific form)(col 4, lines 8-13).

Kuwahara does not expressly teach, but Nakatsuyama teaches "a condition of a pattern of character string possibly contained in the plain text data as" (col 3, lines 20-25, ie., retrieval conditions on the basis of the retrieval formula for defining the structure of the document data, lines 13-15).

It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kuwahara to include retrieval conditions on the basis of the retrieval formula for defining the structure of document data as taught by Nakatsuyama, providing the benefit of a document retrieving means to perform retrieval using semantic description and the schema relating to the first schema and directed to the first retrieval and converts the first formula to a second formula (Abstract section).

**Regarding claim 2**, Kuwahara teaches "adds tags as an identifier ... said retrieving module... in front and rear of each region ...retrieving means " (ie., the data "Tokkyo Taro" set in the position in between tags <Name> and <\Name> tags ... )(col 6, lines 64-67, lines 45-48).

**Regarding claim 6, 7**, Kuwahara teaches "extraction condition ... whole region to be extracted" in claim 6 and "extraction condition ... end part thereof" in claim 7 (ie., Plain text document ... "document for Application" and corresponding end tag

"document for application")(fig 3, item c)(ie., correlation therebetween as one unit)(col 5, lines 60-65).

**Regarding claim 8, 9**, Kuwahara teaches "description pattern ... to be extracted" (ie., in the plain text document "application form for registering e-mail address"; data displayed)(Fig 3, item a; col 6, lines 23-26).

**Regarding claim 10**, Kuwahara teaches "extraction condition ... syntax element of the region to be extracted" (ie., text document is analyzed by software for syntax and tags indicating a ... obtained syntax)(col 1, lines 31-40).

**Regarding claim 11**, Kuwahara teaches "reading ... text format", "reading ... identifier thereof" (ie., conversion form generation module, document read-in module)(col 5, lines 1-20, lines 59-63).

Kuwahara teaches "referring to ... reading step", "extracting ... electronic document", "combining the regions ... definition information" (ie., specific form .. concrete data ... name field, address field; data correlating)(col 6, lines 11-27; col 5, lines 20-30; fig 2; fig 7, item 5).

Kuwahara teaches "generating ... definition information" (col 8, lines 33-38; fig 8).

Kuwahara does not expressly teach, but Nakatsuyama teaches "a condition of a pattern of character string possibly contained in the plain text data as" (col 3, lines 20-25, ie., retrieval conditions on the basis of the retrieval formula for defining the structure of the document data, lines 13-15).

It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kuwahara to include retrieval conditions on the basis of the retrieval

formula for defining the structure of document data as taught by Nakatsuyama, providing the benefit of a document retrieving means to perform retrieval using semantic description and the schema relating to the first schema and directed to the first retrieval and converts the first formula to a second formula (Abstract section).

**Regarding claim 12**, Kuwahara teaches *reading plain text data; reading definition information that defines a correlation between elements as basic units configuring a document structure of a structured document, and that defines, for each of the elements [.] and an identifier thereof* (ie., SGML conversion form generation module SGML document read-in module)(col 5, lines 1-18, lines 59-65).

Kuwahara teaches *referring to the extraction condition per element that is defined by the reading definition information; extracting a region coincident with the per-element extraction condition referred to out of the processing target electronic document* (ie., prototype file of a plain text document)(col 5, lines 27, fig 2, item 105).

Kuwahara teaches *combining the regions extracted with respect to the respective elements in accordance with the correlation between the respective elements that is defined by the definition information* (ie., generate a SGML document from a plain text document prepared by a user as part of the two directional conversion between plain text document and a SGML document having a specific form)(col 4, lines 8-13).

Kuwahara does not expressly teach, but Nakatsuyama teaches *a condition of a pattern of character string possibly contained in the plain text data as* (col 3, lines 20-25, ie., retrieval conditions on the basis of the retrieval formula for defining the structure of the document data, lines 13-15).

It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kuwahara to include retrieval conditions on the basis of the retrieval formula for defining the structure of document data as taught by Nakatsuyama, providing the benefit of a document retrieving means to perform retrieval using semantic description and the schema relating to the first schema and directed to the first retrieval and converts the first formula to a second formula (Abstract section).

**Regarding claim 13**, Kuwahara teaches *generating the structured document by adding to each region an identifier defined by the definition information* (ie., generate a SGML document from a plain text document prepared by a user as part of the two directional conversion between plain text document and a SGML document having a specific form)(col 4, lines 8-13).

**Regarding claim 14**, Kuwahara teaches a *reading module that reads definition information defining a correlation between elements as basic units configuring the document structure, and defining, for each of the elements, [..] and an identifier thereof*; (ie., SGML conversion form generation module SGML document read-in module)(col 5, lines 1-18, lines 59-65).

Kuwahara teaches *a retrieving module which refers to the extraction condition per element that is defined by the definition information read by said reading module, and that extracts a region coincident with the per-element extraction condition referred to out of the processing target electronic document* (ie., prototype file of a plain text document)(col 5, lines 27, fig 2, item 105).

Kuwahara does not expressly teach, but Nakatsuyama teaches *a condition of a pattern of character string possibly contained in the plain text data as an extraction condition* (col 3, lines 20-25, ie., retrieval conditions on the basis of the retrieval formula for defining the structure of the document data, lines 13-15).

It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kuwahara to include retrieval conditions on the basis of the retrieval formula for defining the structure of document data as taught by Nakatsuyama, providing the benefit of a document retrieving means to perform retrieval using semantic description and the schema relating to the first schema and directed to the first retrieval and converts the first formula to a second formula (Abstract section).

**Regarding claim 15**, Kuwahara teaches *a structured document generating module that combines the regions extracted with respect to the respective elements by said retrieving module in accordance with the correlation between the elements that is defined by the definition information* (ie., generate a SGML document from a plain text document prepared by a user as part of the two directional conversion between plain text document and a SGML document having a specific form)(col 4, lines 8-13).

**2-2) Claims 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuwahara (as cited above), in view of Nakatsuyama (as cited above), further in view of Fong et al (US 2002/0085032 A1, effective filing date of Continuation Dec 1997).**

**Regarding claim 3**, Kuwahara in view of Nakatsuyama does not expressly teach, but Fong teaches "correlation between the elements ... hierarchical structure ...

hierarchy ... lower-order hierarchy" (ie., hierarchical SGML document tree structure ... root note which has children nodes)(para 90-93).

Kuwahara in view of Nakatsuyama does not expressly teach, but Fong teaches "retrieving module extracts ... of the element in its higher-order hierarchy" (ie., transformation of a hierarchical document tree structure; Map module 184)(para 90, fig 3A shows hierarchy; para 93). Specifically, using Fong, users can map any object in a SGML tree to any other object in the HTML tree, which includes mapping parents to children.

Kuwahara teaches "generating module adds tags in front and rear of the region..." (col 6, lines 64-67).

Kuwahara in view of Nakatsuyama does not expressly teach, but Fong teaches "... all the elements in the lower-order hierarchy" (ie., add an HTML tag from the Legal HTML Tag list box)(para 140)(ie., a list of legal HTML tags that can be added and inserted)(para 117)(ie., Map module transforms from a hierarchical document tree to the another tree structure document, which allows users to map from document hierarchical elements in a tree to other hierarchical structures in any order: parent-child or child-parent)(para 117, Fig 12B, items 700-708).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kuwahara in view of Nakatsuyama to include a structural document hierarchical mapping tree system that allows Markup language tags as taught by Fong, providing the benefit of creating and editing a mapping of structured information to

different structured information, which allows a user to interactively define the map interactively (Fong, Abstract section, Title).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

3-1) Claims 4 and 5 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 9/21/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. For claims 1, 2, 6-10, 11 Applicant argues that Kuwahara does not teach converting plain text data into a structured document and that an extraction condition as a pattern of a character string itself (Remarks, page 7, bottom). Examiner disagrees with the first portion. Kuwahara teaches converting plain text data into structured document. For example, Kuwhara teaches a two directional conversion between a plain text document and a SGML document having a specific form (which the examiner interprets as a structured document)(col 4, lines 9-14). For claim, applicant's arguments are not persuasive since Kuwahara teaches transformation of a hierarchical document tree structure (Fong, paragraph 90 and 93, fig 3A).

Arguments for claim 4 and 5 are deemed moot as these claims are objected to.

New claims 12-15 are rejected under similar lines of rejection as the amended claims 1-11.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GS

GS

SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER